UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

		AND A LO		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,572	12/22/2003	Gerard H. ROUSSEAU	117421	1571
=	7590 10/30/2007 RIDGE PLC	·	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 320850			AFZALI, SARANG	
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3726	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

,			W
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	······································
	10/707,572	ROUSSEAU, GEF	RARD H.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sarang Afzali	3726	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	Idress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro-		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-14 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-14 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	from consideration.		
Application Papers		·	
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/22/2003 is/are: a) ☒ Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	accepted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). Sected to. See 37 Cl	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ite	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u>,</u>	

Application/Control Number: 10/707,572

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The applicant's amendment filed on 08/09/2007 has been fully considered and made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1-3 and 5-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Morganti et al. (US 6,728,506) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Morganti et al. in view of Boelkins (US 5,690,738).

As applied to claims 1-3, and 6, Morganti et al. teach a roller assembly, comprising:

an oiling roller (31, Figs. 9 and 10);

a roller shaft (nose section 62 and bearing surface 147 of journals 60 and 60a, Figs. 9 and 10) about which the oiling roller rotates; and

at least one cap unit (journal 60, Fig. 9) including a substantially identical pair of caps (journal 60 and 60a, Figs. 9 and 10) disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap further comprises a flange portion (flange portion 149)

Application/Control Number: 10/707,572

Art Unit: 3726

of journal 60, Fig. 9) at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion (145, Fig. 9) at an opposite end of cap wherein the oiling roller has a porous formed body made of compressible material (felt or the like, col. 1, lines 34-37).

In alternative, if the Applicant does not agree that the "felt" material disclosed by Morganti et al. is a porous body made of compressible material, Boelkins teaches a roller assembly wherein an oiling roller (12) includes a porous and compressible felt cover (54, Fig. 7) in order to facilitate the overall uniformity and controlled dispersion of the liquid (col. 8, lines 18-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to have provided Morganti et al. with a porous, compressible felt material as taught by Boelkins in order to provide a suitable roller with an effective and uniform means of releasing oil.

As applied to claim 5, Morganti et al. teach a retainer (ribs 150 and 151, Figs. 9 and 10) disposed onto the end of the roller shaft (68, Fig. 4).

Regarding the limitation the cap "can" be squeezed, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/707,572

Art Unit: 3726

Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-6 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 5. Applicant's amendments to the specification and title are accepted.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3726

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarang Afzali whose telephone number is 571-272-8412. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SA

10/22/2007

DAVID P. BRYANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

10/23/07